

the inner thread of the collar.

11. (original) The connector as claimed in claim 4 further comprising a plug detachably connected to the first adapter.

12. (original) The connector as claimed in claim 11, wherein the plug has a blind hole defined to allow the extension of the first adapter and an outer thread formed to correspond to the inner thread of the collar.

Claims 13-29 (Cancelled).

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 to 12 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, and 7 have been amended. Claims 13 to 29 have been cancelled without prejudice. The amendments find full support in the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

As an initial matter, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Enclosed herewith is a replacement sheet for FIG. 1 and an annotated marked up FIG. 1 showing the changes made. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner review and approve the requested changes.

The Examiner states that the two extended prongs of the second adapter receivable in the plated through holes of the first adapter are not shown in the drawings. Applicant

respectfully submits that the two extended prongs of the second adapter receivable in the plated through holes of the first adapter are shown as reference numeral 212 in FIG. 3.

Additionally, the examiner states that the language of claim recites that the prongs that are associated with the second adapter are receivable in the plated through holes of the first adapter. The examiner alleges that such a limitation may only be satisfied by bending the enclosure, thereby making a circular light. Applicant has amended claim 1 to remove the limitation that the two second pins are "selectively receivable in the two plated holes."

Moreover, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that a first decorative light fitted with the first adapter can be extended by connection with a second decorative light fitted with the second adapter "by inserting the two second pins of the second adapter on the second decorative light into the two plated holes of the first adapter on the first decorative light."

Additionally, FIG. 1 has been amended to show the relationship between the first adapter and the second adapter more clearly. The amendments to claim 1 and FIG. 1, find full support in the specification as filed on page 4, line 22 to page 5, line 4.

The Examiner states that there is no figure suggesting that the collar is positioned over a first adapter of a second light or enclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to FIG. 1 filed herewith clarifies the relationship between the first adapter, the collar and the second adapter.

The Examiner states that there is allegedly no support in the drawings for the limitation of claim 29 that the second cover comprises a pair of keyways corresponding to the pair of keys on the first adapter. Applicant has cancelled claim 29 without prejudice and respectfully

submits that this objection has been obviated.

In view of the amendments to claim 1, the cancellation of claim 29 without prejudice, and in view of the amendments to FIG. 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 to 12, 17 to 20, 22, 24, 25, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner refers to the drawing objections discussed under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) discussed above as supporting the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection.

In view of the amendments to claim 1, the cancellation of claims 13 to 29 without prejudice, and the amendments to FIG. 1 discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification and drawings support all of the limitations contained in claims 1, and 3 to 12. In particular FIG. 1, as amended, supports the relationship between the first adapter on a first decorative light, and the second adapter on a second decorative light, as well as the relationship between the first adapter, the collar and the second adapter. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3 to 12, 17 to 20, 22 24, 25, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, and 21-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner stated that the preamble of claim 1 is confusing, as the preamble suggests that it is the connector for “a resilient transparent enclosure” being claimed and not the enclosure or the flexible light source. Additionally, the Examiner states that as written the claim appears to require that the light will have to be circular for the prong of the second adapter to be connected to the plated holes of the first adapter. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the invention is to a connector for connecting first and second decorative lights. Additionally, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the first adapter is “adapted to be engaged with an end of the first decorative light” and that the second adapter is “adapted to be engaged with an end of the second decorative light.” In view of the amendments to claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

The Examiner pointed out that claims 4 and 7 both depend from claim 2, which has been canceled. The Examiner also pointed out that claim 8 depends from claim 7 and that both claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 4. Applicant has amended claims 4 and 7 to depend from claim 1.

The Examiner also stated that in claim 21, lines 6 to 8 it was unclear what is meant by “a pair of parallel second holes (112) is longitudinally formed on the first adapter and a pair of plated second holes (112), which are electrically extended. . .” Applicant has cancelled claim 21 without prejudice.

The Examiner stated with regard to claims 22, 24 and 28, that it is not clear what is meant by “plated holes comprise elongated sockets with conductive plating inserted therein.

Applicant has cancelled claims 22, 24 and 28 without prejudice.

In view of the amendments to claims 1, 4, and 7, the cancellation of claims 21, 22, 24 and 28 without prejudice, and in view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 13 to 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lin (U.S. Patent No. 4,607,317). Applicant has cancelled claims 13 to 20 without prejudice and therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 4,607,317). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The examiner acknowledges that Lin does not teach the limitations of claim 1 that the first adapter has “a resilient first cover formed by injection molding outside a joint between the combination male-female connector and the first end of the enclosure.” However, the Examiner alleges that it would be obvious to make PVC articles by injection molding.

The connecting device 20 taught by Lin has a connecting plug 20a and a connecting socket 20b. Neither the plug nor the socket is integral with an end of the bulb-holding bar 11. Rather, an area near the ends of the bulb-holding bar 11 are formed into threaded portions 12. Both the connecting plug 20a and the connecting socket 20b are held to the ends of the bulb-holding bar 11 by nuts 22 and 26 respectively. Thus, Lin teaches a totally different method of attaching the components of the connector to the ends of the bulb-holding bar.

The Examiner has provided no motivation for altering the attachment taught by Lin to

the device claimed in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn as to claim 1. Claims 3 to 13 depend from claim 1 and by definition contain all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn with regard to claims 3 to 13 for the reasons given above with regard to claim 1, and because of the additional limitations contained therein.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 4,607,317) in view of Law (U.S. Patent No. 5,669,789). Applicant has cancelled claims 21 to 28 without prejudice and therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 4,607,317) in view of Blanchenot (U.S. Patent No. 3,008,116). Applicant has cancelled claim 29 without prejudice and therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. However, submitted along with this Amendment and Response is a Petition for Suspension for Cause. Claims 13 to 28, now cancelled, were previously added to provoke an interference with U.S. Patent No. 6,379,190 to Prazoff. However, reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,379,190 has been granted. Applicant believes that the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,379,190 are likely to be amended during reexamination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office suspend prosecution of the present application for 6 months to allow the reexamination proceedings of U.S. Patent No. 6,379,190

to conclude, in order to allow Applicant to then attempt to provoke an interference on any applicable allowed claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON & MAK PC

Date: October 1, 2003

By



Marc Karish

Reg. No. 44,816

SHELDON & MAK PC
225 South Lake Avenue
9th Floor
Pasadena, California 91101
626/796-4000